

POCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

**From:** MICHAEL BEERER <mabeerer@pfmicro.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 11/18/97 10:29am  
**Subject:** PAYPHONE ACCESS CHARGE

YOUR RULLING ON PAY PHONE ACCESS CHARGES SUCKS!

IT ONLY SERVES THE POCKET BOOKS OF THE PAY PHONE PROVIDERS WHO WHERE ALREADY MAKING A KILLING. THIS HURTS BUSINESS AND THE LITTLE GUY. BYE THE WAY I HAVE NOT YET SEEN ONE PAY PHONE PROVIDER ANNOUNCE THAT THEY ARE GOING TO LOWER THEIR PAY PHONE CHARGES. -- SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT.

Michael Beerer  
16425 Harbor Blvd. #256  
Fountain Valley, CA 92708  
(714)775-2750  
mabeerer@pfmicro.com

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E

LOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

**From:** Polly Brewington <Polly\_Brewington@mail.sel.sony.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 11/18/97 11:10am  
**Subject:** Pager Toll Free # vs. 30" charge at Pay Phone?

I read an customer news in the SKYTEL Paging's Webpage - www.skytel.com  
I am not sure I understand what you are saying-- charging 30¢ from the pay phone  
or will show up on the invoice.

For an example, I have a personal Skytel service thru Sony Electronics Inc. with  
1-800-759-8888, Pin# 128-5884. When I am calling my son from home, are you  
saying that it is now going to cost me 30¢? and that 30¢ is going to show up on  
my monthly bill?

Example #2 If I am calling from the pay phone to the above Pin#, are you saying  
that it is going to cost me 30¢ at the pay phone? I thought it is 30¢ anyways  
now. Were we suppose to be able to get money back when we are calling the toll  
free number before?

Example #3 Business: we have many pager account with Skytel. Are you saying  
that if I am to page my boss now from work or from Internet, 30¢ will show up in  
the monthly bill now on top of the monthly service charge?  
Please let me know. I read the page on Customer Service Lounge, but it is not  
clear to me.  
My e-mail address is polly\_brewington@mail.sel.sony.com

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

**From:** <tschuh@imperialholly.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 11/18/97 4:44pm  
**Subject:** Upset about the charges to pay Phone Users

Gentlemen:

Is it not enough that pay phones are going up in price in my area, you allow the pay phone companies to get deeper into consumer's pockets and grant them the additional income from 800 numbers. 800 numbers were supposed to be free calls to a consumer and now you are forcing companies to pass these calls on to consumers!

Thanks for NOT watching out for the American consumer AGAIN!

Todd Schuh  
tschuh@imperialholly.com

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E

CKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** "Grundler, Joann D" <GrundJD@LOUISVILLE.STORTEK.COM>  
**To:** "fccinfo@fcc.gov" <fccinfo@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 11/18/97 3:22pm  
**Subject:** Pay Phone charges

9/6/28

I am very upset by the \$.30 charge on 800/888 numbers from pay phones.  
The 800/888 numbers were established to help reduce costs, not increase  
them.  
Joann Grundler

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E

LOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** Del Wimberly <delw@mindspring.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 11/18/97 12:20pm  
**Subject:** Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation

I'm interested in the provision that dictates the \$.35 surcharge per call to toll-free call originating from a pay phone. I provide toll free service to my customers to help them - they need not call me from a pay phone; nor do I want any calls from a pay phone. With a little just a tad of looking, one can easily see that the pay telephone business has gotten totally out of hand - just read the local newspaper business opportunities - you can be placed in the pay telephone business at the blink of an eye - of course the return will probably not pay for your investment, but nonetheless the business opportunity exist. NOW THE FCC decided that the business people who provide 800/888 service to their customers must subsidize and bail out all these so call get rich pay telephone providers - I'm not interested in bailing out anyone -0 that was a business venture - i'm sorry it did not pay, but don't penalize me and every other small business person who now already pays for incorrect numbers; incorrect business, misdials and just a about everything else - we are up to our ears in fees, surcharges; taxes; and anything else that reduces the earning of the business (small and large) that try to operate logically, legally, and sound operating business practices.

My voice may not have any bearing on this issue - apparently it is a done deal according to the long distance telephone company that I pay for 800 service. But I tell you it is not fair. I don't want people calling me from pay telephones and I don't want nor do I believe it is fair for me to pay a surcharge when someone does.

A very concerned small business operator who is struggling to survive under tons of regulations and cost after cost that come in all formats - line connect charges; pay telephone surcharge; telecommunication relay service (that a good one - what does it mean?) FCC charge for Interstate Toll Access - yes, we pay in order to be charged - this charge just more than doubled. I ask - if FCC was paying for their operation from revenue generated would they be as free with the buck - I sure have my doubts.

96-128  
**RECEIVED**

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E

LOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** Don Langrehr <dbl2291@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 11/18/97 10:32am  
**Subject:** FCC 97-371

96-128

Obviously, the FCC mission statement has been tacitly altered. The task of protecting the public interest has been subverted to enhancing the business interest. Your ruling FCC 97-371 continues this swing towards the further aggrandizement of corporate profits. If pay phones and their owners were in financial trouble then perhaps the consumer would have seen less of them as they became less financially viable. The advent of cellular communication has altered phone use but the average pay phone user should not have to make up the difference in corporate profits. Deregulation has already allowed the advent of multidollar charges to phone credit cards. The FCC commissioners have just followed the lead; the antique title of "public servant" has remained the same but the real meaning is "corporate pawn." Your decision regarding FC 97-371 had nothing to do with the public interest. Phone company shareholders will thank... you but not the average consumer.

**RECEIVED**

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
LISTED  
\_\_\_\_\_

DUCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

**From:** Vince Golik <ohvlymgr@bellatlantic.net>  
**To:** "fccinfo@fcc.gov" <fccinfo@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 11/18/97 4:19pm  
**Subject:** Pay Phone Compensation Ruling

I am writing to express my disgust over the recent ruling you made concerning compensating pay phone companies for toll-free calls made from their pay phones.

As an employee of a company whose field personnel utilize a toll-free number for corporate office communications, I feel that this ruling eliminates the nature of toll-free numbers. Our field personnel utilize pay phones for a good portion of their toll-free calling. By allowing this per-call surcharge, you have said to the nation that toll-free calls are no longer toll-free.

Many companies operating pay phones have already received the green light to increase local call prices from 25 cents to at least 35 cents. Additionally, somewhere along the line, maintenance costs are doubtless paid by long-distance companies to the pay phone companies, since long-distance calls are not toll-free.

As I see it, your decision years ago to deregulate the telecommunications industry was a double-edged sword. In many respects, it brought about a new era of competition and service. But at the same time, it allowed a multitude of people to engage in "microBells", that is, small businesses who operate long-distance service, or pay phone service with a relatively small coverage area as compared to giants such as GTE and the Bell companies. And now, because many of these microBell companies are finding themselves barely treading water, they have lobbied and "cried on" the FCC's shoulder to be paid for anything that their phones are used for.

This decision is simply unfair. I feel that it was most likely a result of ambitious lobbying and poor "think-through". Have you considered the costs that will now have to be incurred by companies like the one I work for? It is true that many companies that maintain toll-free numbers find incoming calls originating at residences or businesses; such companies would be mail-order businesses, service organizations, and even telecommunications companies for their customer service hotlines. This ruling probably would not affect them as much as the other half of toll-free subscribers. To companies that have a large number of field personnel and/or calls originating from pay phones for emergency reasons (two examples of this would be local/regional 911 service and national auto club/road repair & emergency services), this ruling places an unfair burden on them to pay what the pay phone companies should have taken upon themselves to address in some more creative way.

I am certain that many people, once made aware of your ruling, will follow people like myself in writing to express disfavor with your decision. It was a very poorly thought-through decision, and it should immediately be reversed.

If pay phone companies need more revenue, they should come up with solutions on their own, and not look for a "handout" from a governmental agency. If they are sinking already, perhaps they should get out of the pay phone business and leave it to those who better know how to succeed in such a business.

-- Vince Golik

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

96-128

**From:** Jack Parsons <JParsons@KineticGroup.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 11/18/97 12:10pm  
**Subject:** Payphones...

Well, you've done it... It was hard enough trying to keep up with a quarter when you have to use a payphone... now we have to have a quarter and something else... depending on what the carrier "feels" like charging for a local, bloody phone call.

Well, FCC - it stinks. If they can "do" what they "feel" like a bunch of hippies at Woodstock... make them provide all the services, especially all these "private" payphone companies.

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

1. No private pay phone company should have the right to reverse the polarity on the DTMF keypad to prevent using an 800 phone number to access my long distance carrier and enter my card #. These pay phone companies reverse the polarity of the DTMF pad, which causes the keypad to no longer function when I try to enter my credit card # or make multiple phone calls from the same payphone - after I have paid the MANDATED local access fee that the pay phone owner "feels" like charging. Then I have to interface with the operator with the long distance company, and sometimes pay a higher rate for Operator Assistance. However, I would not have incurred these charges if they had not locked out the keypad. I have to shop for a payphone now. When I need to make a call, I have to find a "Phone Company Provided" pay phone that will let me access my long distance carrier, make multiple calls, etc.

2. Make private pay phone carriers respect local calling areas. Here in the Dallas Ft. Worth area, we have metro phone numbers. These metro numbers are a local call (what used to be 25 cents - before you guys got all happy and into free love and stuff). To utilize this simple service, I would insert 25 cents (back in the good old days), dial the area code and phone number. Mind you, this only worked if the caller subscribed to the "metro" phone service, but it worked...till those Private Pay Phone companies got the OK from the FCC to do what they want to. Now, a typical attempt to make a metro call from a private pay phone consists of...

- \* Deposit the .35 cents or more, as required by the pay phone vendor (which might as well be at gunpoint)
- \* Dial the 10 digit metro phone number
- \* Get a recording or an operator demanding more money to complete a local metro call
- \* Get in argument with above mentioned offending person or machine
- \* Slam receiver down onto said piece of defecation, allowing a stream of obscenities to be heard by all in ten city blocks
- \* (Optional) remove privately owned pay phone by tying a rope around it...and to your car... and dragging the payphone down I-35 Stemmons Freeway
- \* Locate REAL payphone (either GTE or Southwestern Bell - depending where you are in the D/FW area)
- \* Complete metro phone call, with no problems... no arguments..., etc.

Believe it, or not, these two things are real problems... by reversing the DTMF pad polarity, I can't check voice mail from some pay phones, use credit cards without intervention, etc.

Additionally, not respecting local calling and metro calling zones causes people to "payphone shop," unfairly get overcharged for local

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E



phone calls - sometimes having to use credit cards at .30 per minute or more to complete what is a local call.

What's funny about all this... I can still use a GTE or a SWB payphone... a payphone owned by the telephone company for .25! It is the private phone companies that have gone all happy...

PLEASE - GET THESE JERKS BACK IN LINE... MAKE THEM PLAY BY THE SAME RULES... REPRESENT US.. THE PEOPLE...

Sad is the day that it is cheaper to own a cell phone or PCS than it is to use a pay phone.

Jack Parsons  
E-mail/RAS Admin  
The Kinetic Group  
Dallas, Texas  
(214) 863-3873

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("letters@star-telegram.com","dpek...

96-128

**RECEIVED**

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: "Talib K. Morgan" <talib@andromeda.rutgers.du>  
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
Date: 11/18/97 4:11pm  
Subject: The Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128)

96-128

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my concern about the The Telecom Act of 1996 (Docket No. 96-128). From my understanding of the bill, long-distance companies must pay for non-emergency telephone calls from pay phones. This act, in effect, limits the ability to make "toll-free" calls from pay phones.

For me, and I'm sure other citizens, this is an inconvenience. It does not always happen that I am at a residential or commercial line when I need to make a "toll-free" telephone call. Moreover, many organizations have instituted "toll-free" telephone calls as a way for customers, employees, people in dire-straits (runaway children in need of help come to mind) to be able to contact them. The Telecom Act of 1996 makes those numbers useless.

"Baby-bells" do not need the added revenue of the "toll-free" numbers. In the Northeast alone, Bell-Atlantic has increased the cost of using a pay phone up to 75% (20 cents to 35 cents in many areas). With these additional revenues, companies such as Bell-Atlantic can surely afford not to receive 30 cents for "toll-free" calls.

As a citizen and as someone who regularly uses "toll-free" numbers from pay phones, I ask that you reconsider, and then repeal the Telecom Act of 1996. This is the only solution that benefits all pay-phone users.

It is time that our government stop acting in the best interest of corporations and begin acting in the best interest of the citizens.

Thank you.  
Talib K. morgan

**RECEIVED**

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E

LOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** <Saxman66@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 11/17/97 7:50pm  
**Subject:** FCC ruling on \$0.30 payphone charge

Dear FCC,

This ruling is heinous.

How can I justify to my customers who are calling my nationwide pager that a "toll-free" number is no longer toll-free just because the call is made from a pay-phone.

A phone is a phone is a phone !!!!

This is just one more way the government is trying to rip off the average working Joe.

When I find out who was behind this ruling.... the words gonna get out,.... and we VOTE !!

96-128  
**RECEIVED**

NOV 18 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List A B C D E